

REMARKS

35 USC 102 Rejections

In the parent application claims 1-4 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the patent to Voigt, U.S. Patent No. 4,769,572. It is alleged that Voigt teaches a fan motor assembly comprising a motor, shaft, air fan and motor bracket and baffle assembly interposed between said fan and said motor retaining said bearing. It is further alleged that Voigt teaches a retainer, with said retainer and bracket retaining a bearing therebetween.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendments contained in this response as well as the forthcoming arguments. It should be appreciated that the amended claim 1 as well as claim 11 require the motor assembly be mounted to the bracket. Voigt does not teach this limitation. Voigt provides no teaching or suggestion for the motor assembly to be mounted to the bracket. As such, Voigt does not teach all of the claim limitations and the anticipation rejection was improper. Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Further, claim 3 was rejected as anticipated by Voigt. It is stated Voigt teaches a bracket having a cover plate with a bracket hole therethrough formed with a bearing wall enclosing at least a portion of said bearing. It is respectfully submitted that claim 3 calls for a bearing hole extending "axially" from the plate. The drawing relied upon in rejecting this shows a plate with a bearing hole that is not axial to the plate. Further, Voigt teaches away from this conclusion because the bearing is taught to be "adjustable" and "universally movable within a specific range." (Col 3, ln 13-16) As such, Voigt teaches a bearing whose advantage is that it is free to move and does not restrict the shaft to a strictly axial alignment. One of the advantages of the present invention is that it captures the bearing in a fixed position more effectively than the prior art. Therefore, claim 3 is allowable on its own merit.

It is alleged that claim 4 is anticipated by Voigt. Supposedly, Voigt teaches a retainer comprising a frame having a retainer hole therethrough which is alignable with the bracket hole and an outer race collar extending axially from said frame and around said retainer enclosing a portion of said bearing. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this

rejection. The “retainer” in Voigt does not have an outer race collar extending axially from the frame. As stated earlier, the bearing taught in Voigt is “adjustable” and as such the race collar in Voigt is not axial. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable on its own merit.

35 USC 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Turci, U.S. Patent No. 3,771,911. It is alleged that Turci teaches a fan motor assembly which teaches a retainer 15/20 and bracket, the bracket and retainer capturing said bearing therebetween. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection. It should first be noted that the “retainer” cited in Turci is not “coupled to said bracket” as claim 2 requires. Turci teaches a bearing positioned between the bearing housing and a “shoulder ring” (col 1, ln 68). The “shoulder ring” of Turci clearly spins with the shaft and is in no way coupled with the bracket. As such, Turci does not teach all the claim limitations of amended claim 1. Further, one skilled in the art would not be taught by Turci to retain the bearing with a coupled bracket and retainer. Additionally, Turci does not teach a “motor assembly mounted to said bracket.” The motor assembly of Turci is mounted to a housing and not directly to the bracket. One of the advances of the present invention is the ability to mount the motor directly to the bracket allowing easy assembly. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be taught by Turci to couple the motor assembly to the bracket.

Claim 7 stands rejected because Turci allegedly teaches a bracket having an “alignment post 19 and retainer has an alignment hole.” Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection. Turci does not teach a bracket having an alignment post. The two coupled components in Turci each have screw holes, through which a screw 19 is inserted. As such, the bracket of Turci does not have the claimed feature. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be taught by Turci to use an alignment post. The coupling means of Turci consists of two members with holes attached by inserting a screw. In distinct contrast, the claimed invention utilizes alignment posts to facilitate assembly of the components prior to their assembly. Clearly, Turci teaches away from using alignment posts. Therefore, it does not teach the alignment posts of the present invention and claim 7 is allowable on its own merit.

Examiner further rejected claim 8 as unpatentable over Turci, in view of the patent to Taylor, U.S. Patent No. 4,77,395, stating that Taylor discloses “tab connectors 50 capturing a bearing 44 between a retainer 48 and a bracket 30.” Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection. Claim 8 specifically calls for the retainer “having tab holes alignable with said fastener holes for receiving fasteners to secure said retainer to said bracket.” The tabs taught in Taylor are spring members used to communicate force to a bearing. As such, the tabs of Taylor and the retainer of the present invention are used for entirely divergent purposes. Taylor does not teach one of ordinary skill in the art to use a retainer with holes that receive fasteners to secure the bearing retainer to the bracket.


Claims 11 and 15-16 were also rejected as unpatentable over Turci in view of Taylor. Applicants respectfully request the examiner reexamine these rejections in view of the earlier arguments directed towards the rejections of claims 1-2, 7 and 8.

Claims 17-18 have been rejected as unpatentable over Turci in view of Taylor and in further view of the patent to Nado, U.S. Patent No. 4,746,828. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection. It is stated that Turci teaches “a retainer comprising a frame 20 with a hole therethrough and a brush box extending from the frame.” Turci does not teach a retainer having a brush box extending from a frame. As stated earlier, Turci teaches a “shoulder ring” that clearly rotates with the shaft. This member is not coupled to the member comprising the brush box. Therefore, Applicants maintain that Turci does not teach one of ordinary skill in the art the claim limitations of claims 17 and 18. As such, these claims are considered to be allowable.

No new claims have been added and therefore no additional fees are believed due at this time. Nonetheless, in the event that a fee required for the filing of this document is missing or insufficient, the undersigned attorney hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 18-0987.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments presented herein, the Applicants believe that they have properly set forth the invention and accordingly, a formal Notice of Allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner care to discuss any of the foregoing in greater detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

Respectfully submitted,



Ray L. Weber, Reg. No. 26,519
Andrew B. Morton, Reg. No. 37,400
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
First National Tower - Fourth Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646
E-mail: abmorton@rennerkenner.com